

6. Comments and Coordination .....	6-1
Public Involvement.....	6-1
Public Information Meetings.....	6-1
Project Advisory Committee.....	6-3
Newsletters .....	6-6
Press Releases / Media Involvement.....	6-6
Public Information Web Site .....	6-6
Telephone Information Line.....	6-6
Miscellaneous Meetings.....	6-7
Local Government Resolutions.....	6-8
Agency Coordination .....	6-9

#### Tables

6-1	Meeting Summary .....	6-7
6-2	Agency Coordination Summary.....	6-9

#### Exhibits

6-1	Project Advisory Committee List
6-2	Local Resolutions

## Section 6 Comments and Coordination

## SECTION 6

## Comments and Coordination

---

Section 6 discusses community involvement activities, and coordination with state and federal review agencies and other interest groups during the development and evaluation of alternatives and the preparation of the EIS. The study team offered several opportunities for citizens and state and federal review agencies to be involved in the process. In addition, study team members attended several meetings initiated by local officials and citizens. The public involvement process (described below) was open to all residents and population groups in the study area, and did not exclude any persons because of income, race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or handicap.

### Public Involvement

#### Public Information Meetings

Two public information meetings were held during the engineering and environmental study phase. The meetings were announced with paid display advertisements in the Lake Country Reporter, the Hartford Times Press, the Waukesha Freeman, and the Waukesha and Washington county editions of the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel. The meetings were also announced through individual project newsletters sent to approximately 1,600 property owners, local officials, agencies, and other interest groups.

#### First Public Information Meeting

The first meeting was held on June 29, 1999, at St. Columba's Church located at the WIS 164/County Q intersection in the project corridor. About 155 people attended the open-house meeting, which ran from 4 to 8 p.m. with brief presentations at 5 and 6:30 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce upcoming study activities and schedules; review initial data on existing and future traffic, crash history, deficiencies on the highway; present information from the 2020 Regional Transportation System Plan, including its recommendations for additional capacity on County J/WIS 164 and transfer from county to state jurisdiction; obtain citizen views on congestion, safety, and other problems on the highway; and listen to ideas and concerns that should be considered in developing alternatives. The project limits at the first meeting extended from Capitol Drive to a point south of County E. The portion from I-94 to Capitol Drive was added to the project after the first public meeting.

In general, most citizens acknowledged that traffic on the highway has increased substantially over time. Several people noted that it is difficult to enter and exit subdivisions and other driveways, particularly during morning and evening rush hours. Others expressed concern that redesignation of County J as WIS 164 has encouraged, and will continue to encourage, more traffic use to the corridor. Others expressed concern that they did not know about or have a voice in the jurisdictional transfer decision. There were questions about why the highway is classified a primary north-south arterial and slated for capacity expansion in the regional and county transportation system plans. Several people

noted that WIS 83 and Old WIS 164 already provide additional north-south capacity. There was substantial concern about the effects of a four-lane highway on aesthetics, noise, land use (encouragement of new development), existing subdivision amenities, drainage, property values, and the relatively “rural” character of the corridor.

Several suggestions were made for off-alignment alternatives close to the existing highway, and alternatives that would use other existing highways or new highway segments outside the County J/WIS 164 corridor. These alternatives are discussed in Section 2—Alternatives.

### Second Public Information Meeting

The second public meeting was held on March 16, 2000, at St. Columba’s Church. About 275 people attended the open-house meeting that ran from 4 to 8 p.m. Meeting notices were handled in the same manner as for the first information meeting (newspaper display ads and a newsletter). The focus of the meeting was to present and obtain input on the initial range of alternatives including a preliminary impact summary table; review the results of traffic modeling by SEWRPC to demonstrate how alternatives using other highways or new highway segments outside the County J/WIS 164 corridor would affect traffic on County J/WIS 164; and to discuss upcoming study activities.

Many people who provided comments at or following the meeting indicated a preference for reconstructing the two-lane highway rather than widening it to four lanes. Suggested improvements to the two-lane highway included turning lanes at intersections, passing lanes, cutting hills where sight distance is a problem, reducing the speed limit to 45 mph along the entire corridor, placing signals or warning lights at the Pleasant Hill, WIS 167, WIS 175, and other intersections. Many people questioned the need for additional traffic capacity north of Capitol Drive. Those who have lived along the highway for several years and those who have more recently moved into area subdivisions stated their desire to preserve the rural character and aesthetic quality of the corridor and expressed concern that a four-lane highway will change this character by attracting more traffic. Other concerns included loss of farmland, proximity to homes, increased traffic noise, decreased property values, drainage, safety of children in subdivisions next to the highway, and property access.

Some people supported the Power Corridor alternative because they believed it would reduce traffic on County J/WIS 164 and provide a more direct connection to US 41. Others acknowledged that County J/WIS 164 has always been a major north-south highway and will continue to be used rather than the off-alignment alternatives. Still others supported reconstructing the highway to a four-lane facility. Several people questioned the need for additional highway capacity and stated they do not believe the forecast traffic volumes will materialize. A few people expressed concern that moving ahead with the railroad overhead project at Ackerville will draw more traffic to the corridor. Comments on the off-alignment options at spot locations along the corridor were mixed. In general, there was more support for staying as close as possible to the existing highway rather than shifting the roadway to a new location.

Representatives of the ad hoc Highway J Citizens Group circulated their own materials and visited with those attending the public information meeting to present their concerns about the County J/WIS 164 project. The group’s concerns and recommendations included

opposition to expanding County J/WIS 164 to a four-lane highway, reducing the speed limit to a maximum of 45 mph (70 km/h), improving the existing two-lane highway by adding turning lanes, and widening/improving the Old WIS 164/County Y/US 41 and US 45 corridor to help balance traffic flow through the community.

The group distributed a flyer announcing an upcoming public hearing by the Washington County Board of Supervisors on widening WIS 164 and WisDOT's public hearing on the WIS 164 Lovers Lane project at Ackerville. They also distributed copies of WisDOT's flyer to truckers announcing construction on US 45 and listing WIS 164 as a possible alternate route during construction. The group's concern with using WIS 164 as an alternative route was that it would increase truck traffic on WIS 164, and that it did not make sense to direct trucks over a highway being studied for improvements because it is unsafe and has several deficiencies.

Representatives of the Highway J Citizens group also circulated a "petition" to area residents. The study team received 183 signed petitions that included the following issues and recommendations:

- Opposed to widening County J/WIS 164 to four lanes due to the increased noise and traffic hazard, as well as the reduction of many lots and loss of several homes and businesses along the highway.
- Extend Old WIS 164 from Sussex to County Y because this alternative would provide a more direct route from I-94, Sussex, and Waukesha to US 41/45; there is an existing interchange at County Y and US 41/45; the construction length would be about 5 miles (8 kilometers), as opposed to about 20 miles (32 kilometers) for widening the existing highway; and because it would allow people to access either US 41 or US 45.

Widening County J/WIS 164 would require construction disruption over a long time period, it would require using WIS 60 as a connection to US 41, and it would not provide a direct connection to US 45. Additional traffic on County J/WIS 164, particularly heavy trucks, will create more hazards on the existing highway. A resident and representative of the Willow Springs Mobile Home Park located near the County VV /WIS 74 intersection provided a letter and 272 supporting signatures to the study team. The letter expressed opposition to any off-alignment alternative that would use the County VV corridor. Their concerns included travel safety to and from the Mobile Home Park for the 400 to 500 residents who are 55 years of age and older; pedestrian safety for residents walking to and from St. James Catholic Church adjacent to the Mobile Home Park; proximity to Willow Springs School that also houses a day care center and senior citizen center; proximity to Lied's Nursery whose employees need to cross Town Line Road to access the growing fields; and proximity to Hamilton High School located on Town Line Road.

## Project Advisory Committee

A Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was established to provide input to the study team and to serve as a local link between area citizens and the study team. The PAC includes local officials, citizens, and state and federal agency representatives (see Exhibit 6-1). A list of the PAC members was provided in the take home materials for the public information meetings to encourage local dialogue and contacts. Three PAC meetings were held during activities leading to preparation of the EIS.

### First PAC Meeting

The first PAC meeting was held on August 10, 1999, at St. Columba's Church. In addition to WisDOT and consultant study team members, the meeting was attended by citizen representatives, local officials, and consultant representatives from the Towns of Richfield and Lisbon, Village and City of Pewaukee, and the Village of Sussex, representatives from the Federal Highway Administration, SEWRPC, DNR, and Citizens for a Better Environment.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the regional context and purpose and need for proposed improvements on County J/WIS 164, early engineering efforts on the initial range of alternatives including those suggested at the first public information meeting, possible roadway typical sections, and to review upcoming project activities and the schedule. Key issues identified included the following:

- Concern that redesignation from County J to WIS 164 has increased, and will continue to increase, traffic in the corridor (including trucks)
- The need to consider the land use planning effort under way in the Town of Richfield
- Concern about retaining the rural typical section for further consideration
- Concern about using a rural traffic threshold (7,000 ADT) for determining the need for additional traffic capacity in view of the changing character of the corridor to urban/suburban uses
- Suggestions to drop the speed limit along the entire corridor to 45 mph (75 km/h) to discourage truck traffic
- Request to have SEWRPC model traffic diversion potential for the alternatives that would use other existing highways or new highway segments

### Second PAC Meeting

The second PAC meeting was held on February 23, 2000, at St. Columba's Church. In addition to WisDOT and consultant study team members, the meeting was attended by citizen representatives, local officials, and consultant representatives from the Towns of Richfield and Lisbon, Village and City of Pewaukee, Villages of Sussex, Menomonee Falls and Germantown, representatives from SEWRPC, Waukesha and Washington county transportation departments, and Citizens for a Better Environment.

The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on study activities and the schedule, discuss data gathering activities including the status of archaeological and historic property investigations and wetland delineations, present information on the traffic threshold for providing additional capacity, provide an update on the typical sections being considered, and review the results of SEWRPC traffic diversion modeling.

Key issues identified at the meeting included the following:

- Two representative off-alignment alternatives were modeled by SEWRPC: a new highway link east of County J/WIS 164 that would follow the powerline corridor between Lisbon Road and US 41/45, and a new highway link west of County J/WIS 164 that would bypass the southern part of the corridor and tie back to WIS 164 just north of Lindsay

Road. Several scenarios were modeled regarding speed limits and number of lanes assumed on the highway in conjunction with the new highway links. The modeling results indicated there would not be enough traffic diversion from the highway to preclude the need for additional capacity. At most, diversion could delay the time in which additional capacity is needed on some highway segments.

- WisDOT concluded that the environmental document for the study would be an EIS covering the corridor from I-94 to the south terminus of the Lover's Lane Road project north of County E.
- WisDOT concluded that the traffic threshold for providing additional capacity would be 13,000 ADT (rather than 7,000) to reflect the ongoing transition from rural to urban/suburban land use along County J/WIS 164. Use of the 13,000 threshold delays the time in which additional capacity is needed in Washington County.
- WisDOT concluded that the rural typical section proposed from Plainview Road to project's north terminus, and requiring about 250 feet (76 meters) of right-of-way would be dropped from further consideration. Instead, a hybrid urban/rural typical section requiring roughly 160 feet (49 meters) of right-of-way would be used.
- Citizen representatives continued to oppose widening the highway, to support various off-alignment alternatives, and to limit reconstruction of the highway to spot safety improvements (cutting hills, adding signals and turn lanes at intersections, reducing the speed limit, and adding passing lanes at some locations).
- Several local officials expressed support for widening the highway on its present alignment.

### Third PAC Meeting

The third PAC meeting was held on June 28, 2000, at the Public Library in the Village of Sussex. In addition to WisDOT and consultant study team members, the meeting was attended by citizen representatives, local officials and consultant representatives from the Towns of Richfield and Lisbon, Village and City of Pewaukee, Villages of Sussex, Menomonee Falls and Germantown, representatives from SEWRPC, and the Waukesha and Washington county transportation departments.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the preliminary version of Section 1—Purpose and Need that had been sent to members ahead of the meeting, to review the study team's initial recommendations regarding the alternatives to be retained for detailed evaluation and those to be dropped from further consideration, and to provide an update on project activities including archaeological and historic property investigations. Key issues identified during the meeting included the following:

- A representative from the ad hoc Highway J Citizens Group restated citizen opposition to any four-lane improvements in the corridor and the opinion that traffic dispersal on a two-lane road system would suffice. He disagreed with the project's north terminus, indicating it should overlap with the Lover's Lane Road project at Ackerville. He also disputed traffic data, and provided the following materials with the request that these be part of the record for the PAC meeting: March 23, 2000, letter to WisDOT from Citizens for

a Better Environment and Highway J Citizens Group requesting that the Ackerville bridge project be included in the County J/WIS 164 Draft EIS; June 8, 2000, newspaper article on Waukesha County Traffic Safety Commission meeting indicating traffic counts at four different locations on WIS 164 ranged from 2,761 to 3,412; and February 7, 2000, excerpt from newsletter on Ackerville bridge project indicating that the regional transportation plan calls for capacity expansion between I-94 and WIS 60.

- After considerable discussion on the preliminary range of alternatives, citizen representatives continued to oppose widening the existing highway, and to support off-alignment alternatives, or making spot safety and operational improvements to the two-lane highway.
- Several local officials continued to support widening the highway and to oppose off alignment alternatives.

## Newsletters

Newsletters were sent to local officials, agencies, interest groups, and area residents to keep the public updated on project activities, announce upcoming meetings, summarize community issues and concerns, and to encourage continued public participation in the study. Two newsletters were sent during the EIS activities.

The first newsletter was sent out during June, 1999 to announce the first public information meeting and to provide information about the study, the PAC, and the study schedule. The second newsletter was sent out during March, 2000 to announce the second public information meeting, to provide an update on the study, and to report on the first public meeting and PAC activities, SEWRPC traffic diversion modeling, WisDOT's decision to use the 13,000 ADT threshold for adding highway capacity, and the decision to eliminate the rural typical section from further consideration. The second newsletter also included an insert on questions frequently asked during the course of public involvement and PAC activities.

## Press Releases / Media Involvement

During EIS activities, several articles appeared in area newspapers presenting WisDOT and citizen viewpoints on the proposed improvements to County J/WIS 164. Local radio and television media also provided coverage of WisDOT and citizen input.

## Public Information Web Site

A WisDOT public information web site was established to disseminate project information. The web site contains study information and updates, links to key project communications (public information meeting notes, PAC meeting notes, newsletters, and other information). The web site is accessible on WisDOT's home page at <http://www.dot.state.wi.us>. Once the home page is reached, scroll down and click on "Highway Projects and Studies." Then, click on "State Highway 164 Study."

## Telephone Information Line

A toll-free information number was established at the start of the study so that interested persons could contact the consultant team to discuss ideas and concerns and provide input

to development and refinement of the alternatives. Telephone calls were logged, issues and concerns summarized, and follow up contacts made as needed. Phone numbers for WisDOT team members also were made available for contacts. In addition, several citizens have kept in contact with the study team by e-mail. All inquiries and comments received were responded to and copies kept in the project's public involvement notebook.

### Miscellaneous Meetings

Throughout development and refinement of alternatives and activities leading to the EIS, numerous meetings were held in the study area including those initiated by area residents and local governments, meetings with individual interests, and regularly scheduled local government meetings at which the County J/WIS 164 project was an agenda item. Representatives of WisDOT, the Consultant study team, or both attended the meetings listed in Table 6-1.

TABLE 6-1  
Meeting Summary

Date	Interest Group	Date	Interest Group
April 24, 1999	Lake Park Subdivision	November 18, 1999	Polk Town Board
August 12, 1999	Sussex/Lisbon joint meeting	November 22, 1999	Lisbon Town Board
August 20, 1999	Richfield Plan Commission	December 7, 1999	Germantown Public Works Committee
August 24, 1999	Richfield Town Board	February 17, 2000	Group property owner meeting
August 25, 1999	County Y (Lannon Road) public information meeting	April 11, 2000	Group property owner meeting
August 26, 1999	Sussex/Lisbon joint meeting	May 16, 2000	Richfield Plan Commission
September 1, 1999	Richfield Historical Committee	August 9, 2000	Color Ink business
September 14, 1999	Group property owner meeting	August 14, 2000	Lake Park Subdivision
October 19, 1999	Public meeting at Friess Lake School	August 22, 2000	Law firm representing business interests
October 25, 1999	Lisbon Town Board	August 23, 2000	Case Company business
October 28, 1999	Washington County Highway Committee	October 3, 2000	Pewaukee Village Board
November 8, 1999	Lisbon Town Board	January 16, 2001	Pewaukee Village Board
November 16, 1999	Public meeting at Sussex Hamilton High School	February 6, 2001	Village of Sussex



## Local Government Resolutions

Resolutions, summarized as follows, were passed by local municipalities during activities leading to the Draft EIS. The resolutions are found in Exhibit 6-2.

Town of Lisbon Town Board passed Resolution 7-99, opposing the Power Corridor Alternative and requesting that WisDOT and SEWRPC continue to pursue alternatives along WIS 164 and other alternatives that would more efficiently and safely address area traffic needs.

Village of Lannon passed Resolution 11-8-99, opposing alternatives that would run through the Village of Lannon.

Village of Menomonee Falls passed Resolution 98-R-99, opposing the Power Corridor Alternative and requesting that WisDOT and SEWRPC pursue alternatives along WIS 164 or a more feasible realignment that would be more conducive to traffic using the corridor.

Town of Richfield Town Board passed Resolution 99-10-01, requesting that WisDOT consider:

- Expanding the WIS 164 study and future planning efforts to evaluate alternatives which incorporate other new or existing roadways that may provide a greater and more equitable distribution of traffic throughout the region.
- Revising WIS 164 study and future planning efforts to evaluate existing WIS 164 as an urban facility rather than as a rural facility.
- Evaluating and improving WIS 164 as a two-lane facility.
- Focus immediate attention on eliminating safety problems and deficiencies at the County Q, Hubertus Road, WIS 167, and Pleasant Hill intersections and the steep grades south of WIS 167, Hubertus Road, and north of Monches Road.

Hamilton School District passed a resolution noting traffic flow is a safety concern for school bus traffic, playground safety, and events of the school community; and declaring objection to a four-lane road following Town Line Road past Hamilton High School and Willow Spring Learning Center, or along any other road location that passes a school in the Hamilton School District.

Village of Pewaukee passed Resolution 2000-1, referencing the Village's adopted land use plan that contains overall objectives for providing safe and efficient transportation within the village as well as maintaining and fostering a strong and healthy community. Key recommendations regarding WIS 164 include the following:

- Prior to widening the existing highway through the Village of Pewaukee, WisDOT should fully explore the feasibility of expanding other existing roadways such as Old WIS 164 north of Capitol Drive to meet transportation needs.
- Improvements on or along existing WIS 164 should strive to strengthen the character and quality of the community as well as addressing mobility and safety.

## Agency Coordination

The Notice of Intent to prepare a Draft EIS for the WIS 164 study was published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2000.

Coordination with state and federal review agencies and Native American interests began in the summer of 1999, and continued throughout development and refinement of alternatives and preparation of the Draft EIS. Table 6-2 summarizes key agency coordination activities.

TABLE 6-2  
Agency Coordination Summary

Agency	Coordination Activities and Letters Received
<b>State Agencies</b>	
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	<p>June 21, 1999—letter to DNR notifying about County J/WIS 164 corridor study.</p> <p>July 15, 1999—letter from DNR Bureau of Endangered Resources providing information on possible state-listed threatened or endangered species (see Appendix C, page C-1).</p> <p>September 10, 1999—participated in corridor field review to observe wetlands and other natural resources.</p> <p>August 3, 2000—participated in inter-agency coordination meeting to discuss project purpose and need and range of alternatives being considered.</p> <p>October 25, 2000—letter to DNR offering opportunity to provide any additional comments on purpose and need, alternatives, and other aspects for purposes of Draft EIS.</p> <p>Letter from DNR providing comments on project purpose and need, range of alternatives, and other aspects (see Appendix C, page C-2).</p>
State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHS)	<p>January 21, 2000—participated in initial coordination activities regarding potential historically significant resources along County J/WIS 164; included field review.</p> <p>Miscellaneous contacts during data gathering for information on archaeological and historic resources.</p> <p>February 2, 2001—Participated in meeting with Native American interests.</p> <p>February 6, 2001—Letter from SHS concurring in results of archaeological and historic resource surveys (see Appendix C, page C-3).</p> <p>April 5, 2001—Letter from SHS concurring in results of historic property Determinations of Eligibility to National Register of Historic Places (see Appendix C, page C-4).</p>
Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP)	<p>November 17, 2000—letter to DATCP providing preliminary information on alternatives and impacts on farmland resources.</p> <p>February 14, 2001—Letter from DATCP indicating they will evaluate the project further after selection of a recommended alternative to determine whether an Agricultural Impact Statement will be required (see Appendix C, page C-5).</p>

TABLE 6-2  
Agency Coordination Summary

Agency	Coordination Activities and Letters Received
<b>Federal Agencies</b>	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)	<p>June 1, 2000—letter from COE concurring in FHWA's request to be a Cooperating Agency for the County J/WIS 164 study and EIS (see Appendix C, page C-6).</p> <p>August 3, 2000—participated in inter-agency coordination meeting to discuss project purpose and need and range of alternatives being considered.</p> <p>Miscellaneous contacts to discuss initial comments on purpose and need and alternatives.</p> <p>October 31, 2000—letter to COE offering opportunity to provide any additional comments on purpose and need, alternatives, and other aspects for purposes of Draft EIS.</p> <p>November 28, 2000—Letter from COE concurring in Project Purpose and Need and range of alternatives being considered (see Appendix C, page C-7).</p>
U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (F&W)	<p>June 21, 1999—letter to F&amp;W notifying about County J/WIS 164 corridor study.</p> <p>June 24, 1999—letter from F&amp;W providing information on federally-listed threatened and endangered species and requesting notification of future project activities (see Appendix C, page C-8).</p> <p>October 25, 2000—letter to F&amp;W offering opportunity to provide any additional comments on purpose and need, alternatives, and other aspects for purposes of Draft EIS.</p>
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	<p>June 21, 1999—letter to USEPA notifying about County J/WIS 164 corridor study.</p> <p>August 3, 2000—participated in inter-agency coordination meeting to discuss project purpose and need and range of alternatives being considered.</p> <p>Miscellaneous contacts during evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>October 25, 2000—letter to USEPA offering opportunity to provide any additional comments on purpose and need, alternatives, and other aspects for purposes of Draft EIS.</p> <p>December 21, 2000—Letter from USEPA providing clarification to initial letter (November 29, 2000); concurring in project purpose and need and range of alternatives being considered in the Draft EIS (see Appendix C, page C-9).</p>
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)	<p>June 18, 1999—letter to NRCS notifying about County J/WIS 164 corridor study and requesting information on farmed wetlands.</p> <p>June 24, 1999—letter from NRCS providing maps on farmed wetlands (see Appendix C, page C-10).</p> <p>November 28, 2000—letter to NRCS providing results of farmland impact rating.</p> <p>January 2, 2001—Phone call from NRCS concurring in farmland impact rating and indicating no further action required by NRCS.</p>

TABLE 6-2  
Agency Coordination Summary

Agency	Coordination Activities and Letters Received
U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS)	<p>December 8, 2000—letter to NPS notifying about County J/WIS 164 corridor study, alternatives, and potential impacts on public use recreational facilities.</p> <p>February 15, 2001—Letter from NPS providing funding information on the Bugline Recreation Trail (see Appendix C, page C-11).</p>
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)	<p>November 21, 2000—letter from FHWA to ACHP notifying about potential effects on properties eligible to National Register of Historic Places.</p> <p>December 27, 2000—Letter from ACHP to FHWA listing information that will be needed to determine whether ACHP will participate in the Section 106 consultation process (see Appendix C, page C-12).</p>
<b>Native American Interests</b>	
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, Forest County Potawatomi Community of Wisconsin, Ho-Chunk Nation, Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, Great Lakes Intertribal Council, Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, Sokaogon Chippewa Community of Wisconsin, Stockbridge Munsee Community of Wisconsin, Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma, Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	<p>June 23, 1999 and December 4, 2000 (2 additional tribes)—letter to listed Native American interests notifying about County J/WIS 164 corridor study.</p> <p>Miscellaneous contact with Menominee Tribe regarding their concern about test excavations to determine presence or absence of Native American burial sites.</p> <p>June 30, 1999—Letter from Menominee Indian Tribe indicating no known archaeological sites in area; requesting notification of any cultural resources that might be discovered (see Appendix C, page C-13).</p> <p>July 8, 1999—Letter from Forest County Potawatomi Community expressing concern about any ground disturbing activities that could affect undiscovered cultural resources (see Appendix C, page C-14).</p> <p>July 22, 1999—Letter from Ho-Chunk Heritage Preservation Department discouraging implementation of the project; noting there may be cultural resources of interest to the Ho-Chunk (see Appendix C, page C-15).</p> <p>February 2, 2001—Meeting with representatives from the Menominee, Potawatomi, and Ho-Chunk tribes to discuss the proposed improvements to County J/WIS 164, range of alternatives being considered, results of archaeological and historic property investigations, and to obtain their views on how additional investigations should proceed during a future engineering phase to determine presence or absence of any Native American burials at locations where these resources may occur as identified in the Phase 1 archaeological investigation report.</p> <p>February 16, 2001—Letter from Prairie Band Potawatomi indicating they do not have any objections to the proposed highway improvements (see Appendix C, page C-16).</p>

---

**Wisconsin Department of Transportation**

Mr Scott Ahles  
WIs Dept Of Transportation  
District 2 Design Services  
141 N W Barstow  
Waukesha WI 53187

Mr Brian Bliesner  
WIs Dept Of Transportation  
District 2  
2000 Pewaukee Rd  
Waukesha WI 53187

Mr Roger Cupps  
WIs Dept Of Transportation  
2000 Pewaukee Rd  
Waukesha WI 53187

Mr Bunmi Olapo  
WIs Dept Of Transportation  
District 2  
141 N W Barstow  
Waukesha WI 53187

Ms Linda Hoehne  
WIs Dept Of Transportation  
141 N W Barstow  
Waukesha WI 53187

Mr Art Baumann  
WIs Dept Of Transportation  
District 2  
141 N W Barstow  
Waukesha WI 53187

Mr Jay Waldschmidt  
WIs Dept Of Transportation  
Bureau Of Environment  
P O Box 7915  
Madison WI 53707-7915

**Local Units of Government**

Mr Curt Bolton  
Village Of Sussex  
N64 W2376o Main St  
Sussex WI 53089

Mr Ray Grzys  
Village Of Sussex  
N64 W23760 Main St  
Sussex WI 53089

Mr Jeff Musche  
Town Of Lisbon  
W268 N6646 Lakeview Ct  
Sussex WI 53089

Mr Willard Heppe  
Town Of Polk  
3680 Sth 60  
Slinger WI 53086

Ms Becky Plotecher  
Town Of Lisbon  
N79 W25605 Plainview Rd  
Sussex WI 53089

Mr Jeff Retzlaff  
Town Of Richfield  
4128 Hubertus Rd  
Hubertus WI 53033

Mr Gerald Schmitz  
Town Of Lisbon  
N76 W24726 Ridge Field Dr  
Sussex WI 53089

Mr Jeffrey Weigel  
City Of Pewaukee  
W240 N3065 Pewaukee Rd  
Pewaukee WI 53072

Mr David White P.E.  
Village Of Pewaukee  
1000 Hickory St  
Pewaukee WI 53072

Mr Steve Bruskiwicz  
Village Of Germantown  
Po Box 337  
Germantown WI 53022

**Waukesha County**

Mr Richard Bolte  
Waukesha County  
Transportation Department  
1320 Pewaukee Rd  
Waukesha WI 53188

Mr Gary Evans  
Waukesha County  
Transportation Department  
1320 Pewaukee Road  
Waukesha WI 53188

Mr. Kevin Yanny  
Waukesha County  
Transportation Department

1320 Pewaukee Road  
Waukesha WI 53188

**Washington County**

Mr Kenneth Pesch  
Washington County  
620 E Washington St  
West Bend WI 53095

**Federal/State/Regional Agency Resource Members**

Mr Jerry Collins  
Dept Of Natural Resources  
2300 N Martin Luther King Dr  
Milwaukee WI 53212

Mr Richard Madrzak  
Federal Highway  
Administration, WI Division  
567 D'onofrio Dr  
Madison WI 53719

Mr Ken Yunker  
SEWRPC  
916 N East Avenue  
Waukesha WI 53186

**Other Local Interests**

Ms Faye Amerson (WEAL)  
P O Box 1532  
Brookfield WI 53008

Mr Scott Arganek  
Bonestroo Rosene Anderlik &  
Assoc  
1516 Mequon Rd  
Mequon WI 53092

Mr Robert Hurd  
Lake Park Hoa  
855 Kingston Ct  
Pewaukee WI 53072

Mr Jeffrey R Klug  
Klug's Photo World  
4298 Highway 167  
Hubertus WI 53033

---

Ms Allison Semandel  
Citizens For A Better  
Environment  
152 Wisconsin Ave #510  
Milwaukee WI 53203

Mr Larry Witzling  
Planning and Design Institute  
Inc  
231 E Buffalo  
Suite 100  
Milwaukee WI 53202

Mr Tom Wolf  
Jahnke & Jahnke  
711 W Moreland Blvd  
Waukesha WI 53188

Don & Mary Weiland  
437 Meadow Way  
Colgate WI 53017

Mr Joseph Greco  
N74 W15994 Stonewood  
Drive  
Menomonee Falls WI 53051

Mr Jeff Gonyo  
2668 Hwy 164  
Slinger WI 53086

Mr Daniel Meissner  
N67 W25649 Silver Spring Dr  
Sussex WI 53089-

Mr Steve Holzhauer  
524 Wildwood Ridge  
Colgate WI 53017

H Murray & Kate Shantz  
350 Sth 164  
Colgate WI 53017

Mrs Ann Remmel  
407 Meadow Way  
Colgate WI 53017

Mr Chuck Kugel  
450 Meadow Way  
Colgate WI 53107

Mr Hank Carlson  
N63 W23891 Main St  
Sussex WI 53089

Julius & Judith Cloutier  
435 Meadow Way  
Colgate WI 53017

Mr. Brad Heimlich  
CH2M HILL  
135 N. 84th Street  
Suite 325  
Milwaukee, WI 53214

Mr. Dan Dupies  
CH2M HILL  
135 N. 84th Street  
Suite 325  
Milwaukee, WI 53214

Ms. Mary Ellen O'brien  
Transportation Environmental  
Management  
313 Price Place  
Suite 207  
Madison, WI 53705

Resolution 7-99  
Town of Lisbon  
Opposing the Alternative Alignment of State  
Highway 164

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is currently engaged in a study of State Trunk Highway, (STH) 164 between STH 60 and STH 190; and

WHEREAS, as part of that study, alternative highway designs and alignments are routinely evaluated; and

WHEREAS, one such alignment, known as the "power line alternative" involves an alignment along the current north south STH 74 corridor, then east along County K, and then northerly along the Wisconsin Electric Power Company transmission line right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, this alternative alignment would adversely effect properties, neighborhoods and traffic flow along County K; and

WHEREAS, this alternative is opposed by the Villages of Lannon and Menomonee Falls because of the detrimental impacts in their communities; and

WHEREAS, this alternative does not appear to address the traffic flow generated by development along and west of the STH 164 corridor; and

WHEREAS, this alternative is not consistent with existing Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) transportation plans;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Lisbon opposes the proposed alternative and respectfully requests the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and SEWRPC to continue to pursue alternatives along the existing STH 164 corridor and other alternative alignments which would more efficiently and safely address the traffic needs of the area.

Resolution 99-10-01  
Town of Richfield  
Regarding the Wisconsin Department of Transportation STH 164 Corridor Study and Highway Improvement Alternatives

WHEREAS, the Town Board recognizes the importance of and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's (WisDOT) responsibility for providing and maintaining a safe, convenient, and efficient system of highways, including the roadway formerly known as "County Highway (CTH) J" and now known as "State Highway (STH) 164", that serve residents traveling to, from, and within the Town of Richfield and surrounding communities in southeastern Wisconsin; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town Richfield recognizes and supports the WisDOT STH 164 Corridor Study process as an important and necessary step toward identifying the need for and timing of safety, capacity enhancing, and/or other improvements that may be necessary to maintain the intended function and integrity of STH 164; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board recognizes that, in addition to serving the collective needs and desires of those traveling to and from the surrounding communities and throughout the southeastern Wisconsin region, STH 164 has been and will continue to be an important component of the local road system serving those traveling to, from and within the Town of Richfield; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board acknowledges and accepts the Town's responsibility to regulate and manage future growth, development and traffic circulation within the STH 164 corridor and throughout the Town in a manner that will both preserve the function and efficiency of STH 164 and enhance the quality of life for the town's residents; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and Plan Commission for the Town of Richfield are,

in cooperation with the Citizen's For a Better Environment (CBE) and Planning Design Institute (POI), preparing a detailed land use and transportation circulation plan for the STH 164 corridor as a means of achieving the goals of preserving the function and efficiency of the highway while enhancing the quality of life for the Town's residents; and

WHEREAS, the Town's existing Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates specific areas within the STH 164 corridor as being suitable for additional commercial and residential development that, in combination with additional commercial, residential, and industrial development allowed in other areas of the Town but also served by STH 164, will further change the character of the STH 164 corridor from that of a more traditional "rural highway" setting to that of an urban setting; and

WHEREAS, representatives for WisDOT's consultants, CH2M-Hill, provided information to the Town Board indicating that traffic projections used as the basis for the STH 164 Corridor Study do not justify the need for an overall 4-lane, capacity-enhancing improvement to that portion of STH 164 within the Town of Richfield for at least another 15 years (6,700 to 10,500 vehicles/day by 2015); and, that although the projected traffic volumes for that time period exceed the acceptable level of service "capacity" standard for a 2-lane rural highway (approximately 7,000 vehicles/day), said projections do not exceed the standard for a 2-lane urban roadway (approximately 13,500 vehicles/day);

WHEREAS, the Town Board agrees that, the combination of steep topography, limited sight distance, excessive travel speed above and inadequate enforcement of posted travel speeds along STH 164, increasing volumes of "through" traffic, truck traffic, and a higher percentage of turning vehicles, have all contributed to higher accident rates and unsafe travel conditions at selected locations and intersections along STH 164 in the Town of Richfield; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board agrees that, despite the intended function of an arterial highway like STH 164 and the ideal design requirements for such a highway, and, given the type, amount, proximity, and, in some instances, historical significance of the existing residential, commercial, institutional, and agricultural properties located along the roadway that was just recently transferred to and re-designated as "STH 164", WisDOT has the responsibility to first identify any potential detrimental Impacts any improvement(s) to STH 164 might have on these existing properties and then modify the design requirements for such an improvement or provide other, mutually acceptable measures necessary to mitigate the detrimental impacts on such existing properties; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and Plan Commission did, on September 28, 1999, hold a public information meeting and, on October 7, 1999, hold a public hearing, both for purposes of gathering information and receiving comments, concerns, questions, and ideas from the residents and property owners of the Town of Richfield concerning WisDOT's STH 164 Corridor Study and the potential safety and capacity-enhancing alternatives, e.g. 4-lane expansion, off-line realignment, etc., that are being evaluated as part of that study; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board agrees that, as the collective body elected by the residents of the Town of Richfield to take actions and make decisions and/or recommendations on their behalf concerning local matters affecting Town residents and property owners, including those issues and decisions made by other governments and agencies like WisDOT; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has reviewed and considered the information provided by and/or on behalf of WisDOT concerning the WisDOT STH 164 Corridor Study and possible outcomes, the comments, concerns, and recommendations provided by the Plan Commission and Town Staff, and finally, the written and oral comments, concerns, appeals, petitions, and



interests of affected residents and property owners of the Town:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF RICHFIELD, WASHINGTON COUNTY, WISCONSIN, THAT:

The Town Board requests that the following be considered by WisDOT, their consultants, and other appropriate individuals and governmental representatives involved in and/or having authority and influence over the decision making process regarding the corridor study and any resulting plans for improvement to STH 164:

1. Expand the current STH 164 Corridor Study and future transportation system planning efforts to further evaluate alternative routes comprised of other new and/or existing roadways that may provide a greater and more equitable distribution of traffic throughout the regional highway system serving Southeastern Wisconsin. Greater effort and consideration should be given to identifying and creating a system of highways that serves the entire region in a manner that is more cost-effective, convenient, efficient and less encroaching and intrusive than the existing and potentially more expansive STH 164 route through the Town of Richfield and surrounding communities. Alternative routes that should be considered include, but should not be limited to, the "old" STH 164/CTH Y and the existing Wisconsin Electric Power Co. easement routes to the east route and the STH 83 route to the west.

2. In terms of existing and projected traffic volumes, levels of service and standards for capacity expansion, the STH 164 Study and future transportation system planning efforts should be revised to evaluate the existing STH 164 roadway as an "urban" vs. "rural" facility. Despite the past, the communities within which STH 164 traverses continue to grow and reflect the travel and development characteristics of an urbanizing area and not those of the expansive, rural and agricultural areas they used to be. Being aware that Southeastern Wisconsin

Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) Land Use Plans are the basis upon which the regional transportation system plans are prepared and potential improvements to the State's rural highway system are evaluated, and, being aware that past development decisions and future land use and development plans made by the Town of Richfield and other surrounding communities have and will continue to allow an amount and density of development that is greater than the lower amount and density of development assumed for this area in SEWRPCs land use and transportation plans, the designation of and potential improvements to STH 164 should be reevaluated In an urban vs. rural context,

3. The Town Board can and will support WisDOT efforts to evaluate and improve STH 164 as an urban, 2-lane facility, given the following facts: (1) current WisDOT traffic projections for the STH 164 corridor through the Town of Richfield do not exceed the level of service and capacity-related thresholds for a 2-lane facility if evaluated as an urban vs. rural roadway; (2) WisDOT design standards to atypical urban 2-lane roadway require less right-of-way, lower design and posted travel speeds, and provide more vehicle capacity at the same level of service when compared to a rural, 2-lane facility; (3) the installation of intersection turn-lanes, traffic signals, improved shoulders and pavement conditions all have the effect of increasing the capacity and efficiency of a 2-lane roadway; and (4) the Town of Richfield is working cooperatively with WisDOT in preparing development plans and regulations for the entire STH 164 corridor through the Town, including an access management plan, that will create the opportunity for alternative means of travel, reduce the amount of local vehicle traffic and, in turn, maintain the integrity, function, and capacity of a 2-lane STH 164 in the Town of Richfield.

4. The Town Board requests that WisDOT focus it's most immediate attention and consideration to eliminating the safety problems and turning-lane deficiencies at the principal intersections along STH 164 @ CTH Q, Hubertus Road, STH 167, and Pleasant Hill Road, and, the steep

grades south of STH 167, Hubertus Road, and north of Monches Road. These problems currently exist and will continue to worsen as a result of limited sight distances, excessive travel speed above and inadequate enforcement of the posted travel speeds along STH 164, increasing volumes of non-local "through" traffic, increasing percentages of heavy truck vs. automobile traffic, and increasing percentages of turning vehicles at these intersections with STH 164. Recommended improvements that warrant evaluation should include, but not be limited to, an immediate reduction and increased enforcement of the posted travel speed to 45 mph, and the reduction of the steep grades as noted above, the installation of intersection turn-lanes, traffic signals, and other traffic control and warning devices within two (2) years.

Resolution 11-8-99  
Village of Lannon  
Opposition to State Highway 164 Through the Village of Lannon

WHEREAS, the Village of Lannon has become aware that a group of citizens from the Town of Polk has suggested an alternative route for State Highway 164 which would run north and south through the eastern portion of the Village of Lannon: and

WHEREAS, the Village of Lannon is concerned about this plan and its implications for the Village and its citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board of the Village of Lannon is desirous of expressing its opposition to this plan to the State of Wisconsin Department of Transportation as well as to the Village's state legislators.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Village Board of the Village of Lannon does hereby express its opposition to the potential rerouting of State Highway 164 through the Village of Lannon on the following grounds:

1. That the size and location of the proposed Highway 164 will dramatically change the entire character of the Village of Lannon.

2. That given the relative small size of the Village, the routing of this major highway through the Village will disproportionately impact the tax base of the Village in a negative way in that the land will be lost for future development.

3. That the Village has just completed a Land Use Plan and is adopting a new zoning map and zoning code all of which would be substantially impacted and adversely effected by this major change of land use.

4. That the proposed corridor for the highway would substantially disturb an existing environmental corridor with wetlands as well as a navigable waterway.

5. That this proposed alternative would divert State Highway 164 substantially to the east making for a very indirect traffic path.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Village Clerk is directed to provide this resolution to Mr. Brian Bliesner of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation with copies being submitted to the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission as well as to each of the state legislators representing the Village. Adopted this 8th day of November, 1999, by the Village Board, Village of Lannon, by unanimous resolution.

Resolution 98-R-99  
Village of Menomonee Falls  
Opposing the Alternate Alignment of State Highway 164

WHEREAS, in response to current and projected traffic volumes, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is involved in a study of State Trunk Highway ("STH") 164 between STH 60 and STH 190 (Capitol Drive); and

WHEREAS, as part of such study, alternative highway designs and alternate alignments are routinely evaluated; and

WHEREAS, one such alternate alignment has been proposed by a citizen group residing in the vicinity of the current STH 164 corridor, and involves an alignment in a generally north/south direction through the Village of Menomonee Falls; and

WHEREAS, the corridor in the Village of Menomonee Falls proposed by this citizen group follows Lisbon Road (CTH K) from Town Line Road easterly to a point of approximately 1300 feet west of One Mile Road, and then in a generally northerly direction along the westerly side of the Wisconsin Electric Power Company Transmission Line through the Villages of Menomonee Falls and Lannon to a point along County Line Road (CTH Q) west of the existing Wisconsin Electric Power Company substation; and

WHEREAS, the alternate alignment proposed by this citizen group would affect properties in the Town of Lisbon and the Villages of Germantown and Lannon in addition to the Village of Menomonee Falls; and

WHEREAS, the alternate alignment proposed by this citizen group involves the construction of approximately 6.3 miles of new highway between Lisbon Road and County Line Road of which 3.3 miles is through wetland and/or floodplain, and 3.4 miles is through environmental corridor across, over and along the Fox River; and

WHEREAS, the alternate alignment proposed by this citizen group would adversely affect numerous residences and properties in the Village of Menomonee Falls; including the Ranch, a training center for mentally handicapped adults on Maple Road; and

WHEREAS, the alternate alignment through the Village of Menomonee Falls routes traffic with origins and destinations west of Menomonee Falls through the more urbanized portion of the metropolitan area and adds approximately six miles to the direct route along STH 164 between Hwy. 60 and Capitol Drive; and

WHEREAS, the Land Use Plan of the Village of Menomonee Falls would be adversely affected by the proposed relocation of STH 164 through the Village of Menomonee Falls; and

WHEREAS, infrastructure improvements in support of the Village Land Use Plan have already been installed in the area, and would be affected by the proposed relocation of STH 164; and

WHEREAS, the need to rebuilt STH 164 comes primarily from the development along STH 164, therefore, STH 164 needs to be reconstructed regardless of other alternatives; and

WHEREAS, the alternate alignment proposed by this citizen group results in a more circuitous route through a more urbanized portion of the metropolitan area adding approximately six miles to the length of existing STH 164 between Hwy. 60 and Capitol Drive.

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the above, the Board of Trustees of the Village of Menomonee Falls hereby resolves as follows:

1. The Village of Menomonee Falls strongly objects to the proposal of the citizen group residing along the existing STH 164 corridor to reroute current and projected traffic along that corridor through the Village of Menomonee Falls.
2. The Village of Menomonee Falls respectfully requests that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission reject this alternative alignment due to the adverse impacts that would be created.
3. The Village of Menomonee Falls respectfully requests that the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and Southeastern, Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission pursue alternatives along the existing STH 164 corridor and/or a more feasible realignment which would be more conducive to traffic utilizing that corridor.

4. The Village Clerk-Treasurer is hereby directed to forward a copy of this Resolution to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Southeastern, Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, Waukesha County Board of Supervisors and the offices of every State Senator and State Representative representing the citizens of the Village of Menomonee Falls.

Adopted by the Village Board of the Village of Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin on this 15th day of November, 1999.

Hamilton School District  
Resolution Declaring Opposition to  
Department of Transportation Option to  
Locate Future Four Lane Road Next to District  
School Sites

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is considering several options for location and construction of a future four lane road connecting Capitol Drive and Washington County; and

WHEREAS, several of the options under consideration include routing the future four lane road along Town Line Road and past Hamilton High School and Willow Springs Learning Center; and

WHEREAS, traffic flow is a safety concern for school bus traffic, playground safety, and events of the school and community; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Transportation will make a decision regarding options for the location of the future road in fall, 1999 or winter, 2000; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the children of the Hamilton School District and the community for the Board of Education to take a position on this issue.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the members of the Hamilton School District Board of Education, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, that:

The district hereby officially declares its objection to locate and construct a future four lane road following Town Line Road past Hamilton High School and Willow Springs Learning Center, or along any other road location which passes a school in the Hamilton School District.

The district officially requests the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to place the future four lane road away from any district school locations.

This resolution shall be effective upon its adoption and approval. Adopted and recorded September 7, 1999.

Resolution Number 2001-1  
Village of Pewaukee  
Regarding Wisconsin Department of  
Transportation Highway 164 Project Plan  
Within and Effecting the Village of Pewaukee

WHEREAS, the Village Board of the Village of Pewaukee adopted a Land Use Plan for the Village of Pewaukee on November 17, 1998; and,

WHEREAS, the Land Use Plan identifies an overall objective of providing for safe and efficient transportation within the Village; and,

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is planning a project for Highway 164 which is partially located within the Village that will affect village residents and properties within the village;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Village Board hereby through this resolution communicates the following position to the WDOT in regard to the planned Highway 164 expansion project.

Prior to undertaking a widening of Highway 164 through the Village of Pewaukee, fully and completely explore the feasibility of expanding other existing roadways such as the former Highway 164 north of Capitol Drive to meet transportation needs.

All costs related to any improvements to Highway 164 through the village shall be paid in full by the State and County, the governmental entities involved in the jurisdictional transfer of Highway J and Highway 164.

Strive to strengthen the character and quality of the community while working to address mobility and safety.

Demonstrate to the Village Board specific improvements and/or tools that will be used or undertaken as part of any construction project on or along Highway 164 in the Village that will ensure safety features, sound barriers and aesthetic relief for properties directly impacted by such project.

Limit as allowed by law the weight, speed, size of trucks.

Recognize that quality community neighborhoods are critical to strong, healthy communities and this fact needs appropriate attention when road design is completed.  
Adopted this 16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2001.